IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

GABRYELLE DANIELS, IN THE	§	
INTEREST OF N.D. & J.W.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. SA-25-CA-0114-FB
	§	
COPPERAS COVE I.S.D., CITY OF	§	
COPPERAS COVE,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Before the Court are the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 7) concerning the above-styled cause of action and the Magistrate Judge's review of the pleadings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), along with Plaintiff's advisories and response (docket nos. 12, 13, 15), which the Court construes as written objections to the Report and Recommendation.

Where no party has objected to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of the Report and Recommendation. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made."). In such cases, the Court need only review the Report and Recommendation and determine whether it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989).

On the other hand, any Report and Recommendation to which objection is made requires de novo review by the Court. Such a review means that the Court will examine the entire record, and will make an independent assessment of the law. The Court need not, however, conduct a de novo review

when the objections are frivolous, conclusive, or general in nature. *Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

The Court has thoroughly analyzed Plaintiff's submission in light of the entire record. As required by Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), the Court has conducted an independent review of the entire record in this cause and has conducted a de novo review with respect to those matters raised by the objections. After due consideration, the Court concludes the objections lack merit.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 7) is ACCEPTED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) such that this case is DISMISSED for failure to follow a court order and failure to state a claim.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that motions pending with the Court, if any, are Dismissed as Moot and this case is CLOSED.

It is so ORDERED.

SIGNED this 8th day of April, 2025.

ERED BIERY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE